July 3, 2007

Case No. AUS920010982US1 (9000/86) Serial No.: 10/042,480

Filed: January 9, 2002 Page 2 of 3

## -- REMARKS --

## Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Vidvannand

The §102(e) rejections of claims 1-17 as anticipated by Vidyannand is traversed. In order to sustain the rejection, each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed by the reference in at least as great detail as claimed. Since the reference does not disclose each and every element, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's construction of the claims is untenable, and evidences the failure of Vidyannand to disclose the claimed elements in as great detail as claimed. Specifically, the Examiner's comparison of the claimed "first and second companies" with first and second computers is bizarre at best, and to then compare the claimed "storing transmission capabilities" with sets of printing preferences compounds the error. The Examiner is gently reminded that anticipation requires disclosure of the claimed elements, in as great detail as claimed.

Thus, at a minimum, Vidyannand fails to disclose, in as great detail as claimed:

"receiving transmission capability from a first company and a second company":

"storing transmission capabilities";

"receiving a request from one of the first and second companies to do business with the other company"; and

"determining at least one translation path between the first and second companies based on the transmission capabilities and translation capabilities" as substantially claimed in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Instead, Vidyannand discloses, at most, a reusable and transferrable printer drive preference system.

Therefore, neither independent claims 1, 8, and 15 nor claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-17 depending from claim 1, 8, or 15 respectively, are anticipated by Vidyannand.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-17 is requested.

July 3, 2007

Case No. AUS920010982US1 (9000/86) Serial No.: 10/042,480

Filed: January 9, 2002 Page 3 of 3

## CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-17 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 3, 2007 Respectfully submitted,
PHILIP Y. CHANG, ET. AL.

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

CARDINAL LAW GROUP Suite 2000

1603 Orrington Avenue Evanston, Illinois 60201 Phone: (847) 905-7111

Phone: (847) 905-7111 Fax: (847) 905-7113 Frank C. Nicholas Registration No. 33,983 Attorney for Applicants